

By mail, address to:

MaryAnn Stevens - #08-764 (Antidegradation)
Mail Code 65-40 Rules Section/ Office of Water Quality
Indiana Department of Environmental Management
100 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2251

OFFICIAL COMMENT**By fax: 317-232-8406.***To Whom It May Concern:*

Clearly, there has been no relevance given to the recently adopted Great Lakes Compact if the same violators continue to discharge known pollutants into a now known protected body of water. How does this continue to occur with the protections from EPA, Clean Water Acts and many other state mandates?

Ironically, Indiana was the first to sign on with the Great Lakes Compact, yet continue to be the "per-capita" largest violator of all that the Compact stands for. Why does this continue? Maybe the Compact should have been adopted for just the lower Lake Michigan basin, that way all Indiana violators would have been sited for polluting 100% of the lower basin.

But, when you include the Indiana violators into the all-inclusive waters of all Great Lakes, they are seemingly insignificant.

Please take pause with this action, this is not a solution nor is it a remedy, this is a quick fix to a self-created issue, and our fresh waters are not given to any one entity for personal gain. It's our continued duty to protect them, and to dis-continue the actions of the known abusers.

Ironically, our states permit waters to be harvested in their purest form upstream of all human contact, yet at the same-time our states also permit the discharge of chemicals that are not fit for human contact into our lakes, specifically Lake Michigan.

How does this makes any sense to anyone with any degree of intelligence?

A common sense solution would be to only allow the harvesting of fresh waters from Lake Michigan just off the Indiana coast, by doing this, it would require that the bottled water companies filter and purify the water to tolerances fit for human consumption, and at the same time clean the very chemicals that are being allowed and permitted to be discharged. The only draw back would be that a single 12 ounce bottle of water would increase in cost to \$100 each.

Clearly, no one would buy water at this cost, so why are you asking us, the public, to buy the argument that these continued discharges are in the public good.....??

It is your duty to defend that which has no voice, our Lake Michigan waters, for the future of the common good for all.

*Norman Dodds Architect
Pentwater MI
231-869-5667
member Great Lakes Surfrider chapter*